

The People of the State of New York, Respondent, v. Jay Walters, Appellant.

95-01409

SUPREME COURT OF NEW YORK, APPELLATE DIVISION, SECOND  
DEPARTMENT

251 A.D.2d 433; 674 N.Y.S.2d 114; 1998 N.Y. App. Div. LEXIS 6551

April 13, 1998, Argued  
June 8, 1998, Decided

**PRIOR HISTORY:** [\*\*\*1]

Appeal by the defendant from a judgment of the Supreme Court, Queens County (Katz, J.), rendered February 1, 1995, convicting him of attempted murder in the second degree, robbery in the first degree (three counts), robbery in the second degree, assault in the first degree, assault in the second degree, criminal possession of a weapon in the second degree, and criminal possession of a weapon in the third degree, upon a jury verdict, and imposing sentence.

**DISPOSITION:** ORDERED that the judgment is reversed, on the law and as a matter of discretion in the interest of justice, and a new trial is ordered.

**LexisNexis(R) Headnotes**

**COUNSEL:** Daniel L. Greenberg, New York, N.Y. (Allen Fallek of counsel), for appellant.

Richard A. Brown, District Attorney, Kew Gardens, N.Y. (John M. Castellano and Alyson J. Gill of counsel), for respondent.

**JUDGES:** Friedmann, J. P., Goldstein, Florio and Luciano, JJ., concur.

**OPINION:** [\*434] [\*\*115] Ordered that the judgment is reversed, on the law and as a matter of discretion in the interest of justice, and a new trial is ordered.

The defendant's right to be present for all material stages of his trial was not violated by his absence from that portion of his *Wade* hearing referred [\*\*\*2] to in his

brief (*see*, [\*\*116] *People v Morales*, 80 NY2d 450; *People v Dokes*, 79 NY2d 656, 660).

However, the prosecutor exceeded the boundaries of appropriate advocacy. Defense counsel objected to many of the prosecutor's improper summation comments and moved for a mistrial both during and after the prosecutor's summation. To the extent that the defendant's objections to some of the improper summation comments were not properly preserved for appellate review, we pass upon them under our authority to do so in the interest of justice (*see*, CPL 470.15 [6] [a]).

It was improper for the prosecutor to persist in making purposefully inflammatory remarks designed to appeal to the jury's sympathy (*see*, *People v Ashwal*, 39 NY2d 105, 106). The prosecutor's remarks during his summation, *inter alia*, that the victim was left "on the street to die, to die like a dog", and that but for the crime, "was probably going to be a brilliant artist", and his invitations to "imagine what a shock it was to [the victim's wife], who's eight months pregnant", were unnecessary and [\*\*\*3] improper.

The prosecutor also improperly shifted the burden of proof to the defendant when, during his summation, he asked the jury, rhetorically, "did [the defendant] call any additional witnesses?", and then supplied the answer, "no". Similarly, it was improper to tell the jury that "the only real evidence is the People's evidence" (*see*, e.g., *People v Torres*, 223 AD2d 741, 742). The prosecutor's accusation, also during summation, that the defendant tailored his own testimony after he heard the testimony of prosecution witnesses, was likewise improper (*see*, *People v Butler*, 185 AD2d 141; *People v Negron*, 161 AD2d 537).

251 A.D.2d 433, \*, 674 N.Y.S.2d 114, \*\*;  
1998 N.Y. App. Div. LEXIS 6551, \*\*\*

The prosecutor in his summation improperly described the defendant's testimony as "continued lies on top of lies, on top of lies", and "tales and lies, back and forth, back and forth" (see, e.g., *People v Nevedo*, 202 AD2d 183; *People v Ortiz*, 125 AD2d 502; *People v Valdivia*, 108 AD2d 885; *People v Jaime*, 84 AD2d 696; *People v Goggins*, 64 AD2d 717). Furthermore, the prosecutor gave his own opinion regarding the truth and [\*\*\*4] [\*435] falsity of witnesses' testimony, and vouched for the victim's credibility (see, *People v Bailey*, 58 NY2d 272; *People v Whitehurst*, 87 AD2d 896).

Most egregious was the prosecutor's insinuation that the gun which had been recovered from the defendant two weeks after the crime in an unrelated arrest, may have been the gun which was used to shoot the victim. He persisted with this implication despite his knowledge that the ballistics test performed by police conclusively established that the gun had not been used in the crime. The prosecutor's conduct in advocating a position which he knew to be false was an abrogation of his

responsibility as a prosecutor (see, *People v Cotton*, 242 AD2d 638).

The prejudice to the defendant was compounded, and the prosecutor's misconduct was not only condoned in the eyes of the jury, but perhaps also encouraged, by the court's improper overruling of defense counsel's objections to blatantly improper remarks and, at one point, berating the defendant's attorney for continually interrupting the prosecutor's closing, and telling him to sit down (see, *People v De Jesus*, 42 NY2d 519; [\*\*\*5] *People v Kent*, 125 AD2d 590). Since the evidence in this one-witness identification case was not overwhelming, a new trial is required (see, *People v Bailey*, *supra*).

In light of the foregoing, we do not reach the defendant's remaining contention.

Friedmann, J. P., Goldstein, Florio and Luciano, JJ., concur.

MARY F. KELLY  
CHAIRPERSON

State of New York  
Grievance Committee for the  
Ninth Judicial District

CROSSWEST OFFICE CENTER  
399 KNOLLWOOD ROAD - SUITE 200  
WHITE PLAINS, N.Y. 10603

914-949-4340

December 3, 1999

GARY L. CASELLA  
CHIEF COUNSEL

FAITH LORENZO  
DEPUTY COUNSEL

GARY D. EGERMAN  
GLORIA A. BUNZE  
FORREST STRAUSS  
MATTHEW RENERT  
ANTONIA P. CIPOLLONE  
FREDDA FIXLER-FUCHS  
STAFF COUNSEL

ANTHONY R. WYNNE, ESQ.

PATRICK A. SMITH  
INVESTIGATOR

CONFIDENTIAL

Claude N. Stuart, Esq.  
125-01 Queens Blvd.  
Kew Gardens, New York 11415

Re.: File #16095/98  
o/c/o Seda, Samantha

Dear Mr. Stuart:


Following an investigation, the above-referenced matter was considered by the Grievance Committee for the Ninth Judicial District at its last meeting.

After due deliberation, the Committee found that during the course of the trial of People v. Walters, Indictment No. 2555/92, you engaged in prosecutorial misconduct. The Appellate Division, Second Department, by Decision & Order dated June 8, 1998, found that you "exceeded the boundaries of appropriate advocacy." In addition, the Court found that you gave your own opinion regarding the truth and falsity of witnesses' testimony, vouched for the victim's credibility, and advocated a position which you knew to be false. By engaging in such conduct, the Committee found that you violated 22 NYCRR sections 1200.37(c)(4), and 1200.37(c)(1).

The Committee considered all of the mitigating circumstances offered by you, including the fact that you have conducted many felony trials since the time of this trial without engaging in similar misconduct.

For these reasons, the Grievance Committee for the Ninth Judicial District has authorized the issuance of this Letter of Caution pursuant to §691.6 of the Rules Governing the Conduct of Attorneys for the Appellate Division, Second Department.

Very truly yours,



Mary F. Kelly  
Chairperson

MFK/vem

